

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 24 2007

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-11 are currently pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 9 are independent.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 1-11 stand improperly rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Rankin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,879,838).

Applicant submits that the teachings disclosed in Rankin fail to teach all of the claim limitations of Claim 1, which recites, *inter alia*:

...announcing said prayer timings after receiving appropriate electronic signal from a wireless communication network.

Rankin discloses a system that provides a mobile user with information related to resources in their geographical region. The mobile device 100 will determine its own location and communicate that information to a location determination system 117. Once the location of the mobile device 100 is known, a map with local resources may be downloaded to the mobile device 100. Further Rankin discloses a GPS system used to locate the mobile device. None of the teachings of Rankin disclose any type of time information necessary to announce prayer timings after receiving appropriate electronic signal from a wireless communication network, as recited in Claim 1.

Furthermore, the Examiner incorrectly alleges:

“muslim prayer timings would be a routine and obvious choice in the absence of criticality to the present invention.”

This is again not the proper standard for obviousness. If the Examiner is relying on personal knowledge to support a finding of what is known in the art, the Examiner must provide an Affidavit or Declaration setting forth specific factual statements and explanation to support the

finding. See 37 CFR 1.104(d)(2) and MPEP 2144.03(c). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully challenge the Examiner's use of design choice and respectfully require the Examiner to withdraw the rejection or provide an Affidavit or Declaration as set forth above if the rejection is to be maintained.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that independent claim 1 and those claims dependent thereon are allowable over the prior art. Withdrawal of this rejection and an allowance of these claims are kindly requested.

With regard to independent claim 9, Applicant submits that for reasons substantially similar to those stated above with regard to independent claim 1, that claim 9 and those claims dependent thereon are also allowable over the prior art.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned, at the telephone number listed below.

With best regards,



Kamran Emdadi
Registration No. 58,823

2025 Beacon Place
Reston VA 20191
571.437.7660

Date: April 24, 2007